

THE  
*Amazon* Disarm'd :  
OR, THE  
SOPHISMS  
OF A  
SCHISMATICAL PAMPHLET,

Pretendedly Writ by a  
GENTLEWOMAN,  
ENTITLED,  
An Answer to *Donatus Redivivus*,  
EXPOSED and CONFUTED;

Being a further Vindication of the  
*Church of England*, from the Scan-  
dalous Imputation of *Donatism* or  
*Re-baptization*.

In a LETTER to two *Manchester*  
*Levites*, occasion'd by their Publick De-  
fence of their Crime, in Perverting and  
Re-baptizing two Young Gentlewomen.  
With an Epistle prefix'd to one of the Lady's  
by a Young Gentleman.

*Miva verò Majestas Theologorum, si solis illis fas est  
Mendose loqui. Erasmi. Encom. Moriar. p. 109.  
Lug. Batav. MDCXVII.*

Dare to be true; nothing can need a Lye.  
A Fault which needs it most, grows two thereby.  
*Herbert's Ch. Porch.*

London: Printed for J. Roberts at the Oxford-Arms  
in Warwick-Lane. 1714. (Price 6 d.)

THE HISTORY OF

THE LIVES OF

SOPHIA

AND

HER DAUGHTER

THE LADY OF

THE

WOMAN

IN

THE

CONSTITUTION

OF

THE

WOMAN

IN

THE

CONSTITUTION

OF

THE

WOMAN

IN

THE

CONSTITUTION

OF

THE

WOMAN

IN

THE

CONSTITUTION

OF

THE

WOMAN

IN

THE

CONSTITUTION

To the  
and  
M--

GENT  
THIS  
ble

the late  
Vindica

atus; a  
entiments

er upon  
nuously p

and then  
ty of tre

manner, of  
female C

ersonate b  
hich with

s, are th  
is Medle

table An

WHA  
ming a

an to An

traduce  
re Surmi

ges of R

Scandalor

TO the Reverend Mr. L----ter,  
and the Demi-reverend Mr.  
M---l---n.

GENTLEMEN,

**T**HIS Letter belongs to you upon a double account, as you were the chief Actors in the late Re-baptization, and are the supposed Vindicators of it, in the Answer to Dominatus; a Treatise writ in Defence of the Sentiments of the Church, which you Father upon a Dissenting Minister, and discontinuously point out to Mr. O——n by Name; and then by way of Answer, assume the Liberty of treating him in the most Scurrilous Manner, screening yourselves under the little female Character, which you compleatly personate by your noisy and impotent Malice, which with many Falshoods and pitiful Evasions, are the main props of your Cause; and this Medley you palm upon the World as a notable Answer.

WHAT can be more unworthy and unbecoming a Scholar, Gentleman, or Christian, than to Answer an Argument with Scurrility, to traduce a Gentleman's Character upon a bare Surmise, and to fly to the mean subterfuges of Raillery and Defamation in defence of a Scandalous Cause?

A 2

YOUR



## DEDICATION.

YOUR Contrivance, indeed, is very commendable, in placing your deficient Performance under the Patronage of a young Lady; a piece of Complaisance, which, perhaps may be agreeable to the Vanity of weaker Minds; but the Thinking part of the Sex must needs resent this Artifice of yours, in making them Midwives of a Pamphlet, which for its Impertinence, Rudeness and Folly, you yourselves were ashamed to own.

As for Mrs. C——l——n's being the Author of it, I so much doubt, as to question whether she ever saw it before it was Printed, because of that Common-sewer of Billingsgate which runs thro' the whole Book for I am perswaded, that neither her Conscience or Breeding, wou'd allow her to make Lies her Refuge, or calumniate any Person, after such an outrageous manner.

Now Messieurs Levites, for you to stick a Libel with so many foul Invectives, uncharitable Innuendo's, and opprobrious Language and then to Father it upon an innocent Gentlewoman, is very unjust and unhandsome.

I can't therefore but do the World so much justice, as to let 'em know, how you have imposed upon them in the Title Page, by ascribing your Answer to a wrong Person; therefore to set the Saddle on the right Horse, I think my self obliged to assure the Reader that in the highest probability Mr. L——t—— and Mr. M——l——n, by the assistance of some more considerable than themselves



## DEDICATION.

were the Authors of it. But and if they should deny their having any Hand in the Compiling of it, let the real Authors take all the Reflection that concerns them as such, to themselves; however, these two young Clergy-men having the chief Hand in the late Re-baptization, and still persisting in the Error, are the principal Parties I have to do with. Thus much by way of Precaution, to prevent a Report; nevertheless, that I may directly confront the Title Page, I stile mine, the Amazon Disarm'd.

WHAT I chiefly consider in your Book, is the Argumentative Part, where I confute your pretended Solutions of Optatus's Arguments, and further confirm his Propositions.

I had prosecuted the Arguments from the Fathers, but that you have dropt 'em, and acknowledge they are above your Feminine Capacity; besides Mr. Bingham in his way, has made unanswerable advances in that kind of Proof, notwithstanding the painful Opposition of Dr. Bret.

SINCE you have only thought fit to attack the Argument adduced from the Practice of the Church, I shall keep close to that Subject, nor will I be diverted from it by any collateral Dispute; but since I have drawn my Pen in Defence of the Church, I'll wear it to the Stump in that Meritorious Combat.

WELL then, the question is not, Whether Presbyterian or even Lay-baptism, is valid in it self or no; but whether the Church  
of

## DEDICATION.

of England doth in her Judgment and Practice allow of it? I'll not differ with you about meer Terms; its equal to the Case before us, whether Presbyterian be Lay-baptism or no, or whether Lay-baptism be in itself valid or no; but whether the Church of England doth allow of that which all agree to be Lay-baptism, and also of that, which some only call Lay, and others, Presbyterian Baptism; so that the Hinge of the Controversy turns not upon the intrinsic validity of the Thing it self, but upon the Sentiments of the English Church concerning it; therefore if I prove your Re-baptizing Practice to be disagreeable to the Judgment of the Church, I gain my Point.

---

CHAP

Ama

H

book) wh  
ages, Tw  
erous and  
ose; wh  
Decency b  
ummaging  
east Perfo  
not particu  
istinct Re  
The 3d  
book, exp  
acter of th  
made Pu  
their Practi  
zance.

In the sa  
o assert,  
rdid Moti  
ng, were r  
presented  
this to th  
Page 4.  
pposed A  
s Parry t

# THE Amazon Disarm'd, &c.

## CHAP. I.

**H**AVING thus Advertised you of my Design in the Reply, I come next to consider your Answer, (which only affects one Limb of your Adversary's Book) which Answer consists of Twenty Four Pages, Twelve of which are spent in Obstreperous and Noisom Rant, nothing to the purpose; which Sink might with a great deal of Decency be skipt over, and the stench which summing in it would cause, be avoided; but least Persons should think it unanswerable, if not particularly reply'd to, I shall make some distinct Reflections upon the several Pages of it.

The 3d Page, which is the beginning of your Book, expresses a great Concern, that the Character of the Re-baptizer and his Comrade should be made Publick, which makes it suspicious, their Practice wou'd not bear the publick Cognizance.

In the same Page, the Gentlewoman is made to assert, *That the ablest Dissenting Ministers, and did Motives of Self-Interest, much severe Threatning, were made use of to reclaim her.* Which, as presented, is entirely false, but if true, What has this to the Argument?

Page 4. Contains paltry Reflections upon the supposed Author of *Donatus*, [as if employed by the Party to calumniate the Re-baptizers and the  
Prose-



*Profelytes, with false accounts that were transmitted to him,]* endeavouring hereby to expose his Honesty and Learning, which is still nothing to the Matter in Hand, (tho' he were as defective as either of his Antagonists) and remoter from Truth, for he was never so much as desired to do it. But this is a plain Indication of the weakness of their Cause, when the Character of a Person must be sullied to invalidate the Evidence of Truth.

Page 5. Charges him with stealing the Arguments, and suppressing the Answers; this is False, since *Optatus* has brought new Arguments, and made considerable improvement on old ones; besides, his Business was to reduce the Controversy to a narrow compass, and to Collect what he thought most conclusive on the Head, and which he Prosecutes in a different Method; so that he could no more be counted a Plagiary on that account, than *Justinian*, *Leighton*, &c. The Reason why he omitted giving the Answers, was, because he really found none such; which will further appear when we come to consider what the Adversaries offer in Answer to him, which we may take for granted are the best they could pick.

In the same Page, it's Insinuated, That the Baptism was *Hypothetical*, and consequent upon the earnest Application. — I allow all the Baptism of the Church to be *Hypothetical*, as may be seen by the first Question propos'd at the Font; this is not the thing in Question, for we all agree in Baptizing those who were not Baptized before; but the Question is, What Authority has a particular Priest to determine a Dissenting Minister's, or even a Layman's sprinkling a Person in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, not to be Baptism, when allow'd by the Church to be so?

As for  
chiefly th  
Re-bapti  
contrary  
any pub  
case of S  
decide fo  
mining P  
neither y  
an Act of

Page 6.

ate Mr.  
Invalidity  
and his A  
and very

he doth n  
who, it i

Confessor,  
as, by on  
will be hara  
ame to the

A prett  
roving th  
f Intreag

That the  
lain, tha  
lain; but

r Design,  
nd others  
on, make

Page 7.

charged w  
arty, than

This is so  
nowledge  
ances of H

ard to som

As for what they say of my Lord the Bishop, I defy them to prove that he ever encourag'd the Re-baptizing of Presbyterians, but rather the contrary; neither has the Church it self, by any publick Act, determin'd what's to be done in case of Scruples, nor allows private Persons to decide so important a Matter; which determining Power is lodg'd in the Convocation; neither yet can their Decision be Valid without an Act of Parliament.

Page 6. Here the *Amazon* is made to Vindicate Mr. L — t — r, from perswading her of the Invalidity of her former Baptism, and to clear him and his Accomplissee from Boarding-School Visits, and very finely she doth it. We'll grant Mr. L — t — r did not tamper with her, but she doth not pretend to quit Mr. M — l — n, who, it is taken for granted, was her Father Confessor, till she brings a better Proof than she has, by only telling us, she believes Mr. O — n will be hard put to it, to prove that either of 'em came to the Boarding-School on that Intent.

A pretty come off truly, to put Men upon proving the Intentions and Designs of a couple of Intreaguing Gallants.

That they frequented the Boarding-School is plain, that such Consequence followed, is as plain; but whether it was the product of Chance or Design, the Persons concern'd can best tell, and others may without the Spirit of Divination, make a pretty near Guess.

Page 7. The supposed Author of *Donatus*, is charged with being more studious of gratifying a party, than of giving a true account of the Matter.

This is so far from being Truth, that to my knowledge *Optatus* suppress'd many Circumstances of his Information, out of a friendly regard to some Persons and their Relatives.

B

And

And thus the Answerer finishes his Remarks upon the Dedication and Introduction; telling us withal, that he past by *many Pitiful, Malicious, Groundless Suggestions, Notorious Blunders, and Improperities of Style.*

*These* are only Words in Course, without any Proof, which, doubtless if there had been any Foundation for them, they would have adduced; since, in the sequel of the Discourse, as insignificant and trivial things are taken notice of, as any of these can be supposed to be.

Page 8. *These* two Clergymen, by Writing under the Character of a Woman, excuse themselves from taking notice of *Optatus's* Quotations, which they condemn in the bulk, because of his falsely translating a Scrap of Latin in the Title Page, as they say.

A pretty sort of Argument, if the Matter of Fact were true; such a one has Misconstrued a piece of Latin, therefore 'tis very likely he's Mistaken in all his Quotations: Because a Man can't translate one Language into another, therefore he can't transcribe any Passage faithfully. *O rare Logicians*, to draw an universal Conclusion from particular Premises!

But after all, that scrap of Latin is rightly translated enough, and that agreeable to the Laws of Translation, which require no more than that the general Purport and Sense of the Author should be render'd; yet for the Benefit of the young *Levites* who can see no further into a scrap of Latin, than into a Syllogism, I'll translate that difficult Sentence *Verbatim.*

*Enim* for, *revera* truly, *fieri potest* it may be that, *Re-baptizator* the Re-baptizer, *totius* of the whole Man, *sic* should be *Sceleratior* more Wicked, *quam* than, *Inter*

rempt  
alon

Now in

more tha

Re-bapti

Thus yo

A. Optatu

Stile, fal

Selves wit

In the

bringing Sc

answering

former pa

reign to h

judgment

do any m

Lay-Bapti

Value; h

out 'em,

gments in

may fine

ration.

Page 9.

ble in it.

ection on

y to Law,

hing to th

vent before

to joyn If

roofs fro

ow well

Page 10.

lose to hi

Lay-Bapti

ith it, qu

stead of c

more than

remptor



remptor a Killer, *solius Corporis*, of the Body alone.

Now in my Apprehension, this comes to no more than what *Optatus* made of it, viz. That a Re-baptizer is worse than a Murderer.

Thus you see the same Persons who charg'd *A. Optatus* with Blunders and Improprieties of Style, fall really into those Absurdities themselves with which they falsely tax him.

In the same Page, *Optatus* is blam'd for not bringing Scripture to prove Lay-Baptism, and for not answering the Arguments against it. As to the former part of the Charge, Scripture was foreign to his Purpose, since he only defended the Judgment and Practice of the Church; nor will he do any more. And as to the Arguments against Lay-Baptism, it's propable he saw none of any Value; however since you make such a stir about 'em, I shall take exact Notice of your Arguments in the sequel of the Answer, and I wish you may find any Thing in 'em worth my Observation.

Page 9. This Page has nothing else Remarkable in it, but a snarling and ill-natur'd Reflection on Mr. O — n, for keeping Pupils contrary to Law, (which as it is entirely False, and nothing to the Purpose, is of a Piece with what went before) and a willingness in the Answerer to joyn Issue with him in the Tryal of his proofs from Antiquity. — But let us see how well he acquits himself of his Promise.

Page 10. *Optatus* is Attackt as not keeping close to his Subject, in that he pretends to prove Lay-Baptism, and then jumbles another Proposition with it, quite foreign to the Point in debate; and instead of confining himself to the former, proves more than Heretical Baptism.

How unjust and unreasonable this Imputation is, will appear if you observe,

1. That they misrepresent the first Article *Optatus* design'd to prove. For he tells us,

That to Re-baptize any Person that was once Baptized, *EVEN* by Laymen, in the Name of the Sacred Trinity, is contrary to the Practice of the Catholick Church, P. iv

but they, by *foolishly*, or *knavishly* leaving out the Word *EVEN*, quite alter the Sense of the Proposition, and so having by this Blunder, or Juggle, made *Optatus* inconsistent with himself, they treat him as such, *i. e.* to speak in their own Dialect, *they as it were dress him up in the Skin of some wild Beast, and then fall a Worshipping him.*

In order to prove their Assertion, they pretend to quote the Contents of his first Chapter but leave out the most material Part of it which if mention'd, wou'd have effectually prevented that wonderful Discovery.

2. If we consider the Connexion of the first Proposition in *Donatus Redivivus*, with the Contents of the first Chapter, we shall find that notwithstanding the Adversaries misrepresentations, he has kept close to the Point in debate.

They say, he promised to confine himself to Lay-Baptism, and that in his Contents he proves only the Validity of Heretical Baptism.

Whereas both in the Contents and Body of that Chapter, he proves expressly, That both were allow'd in the Primitive Church, and this agreeably to his first Proposition, wherein, tho' He

retical

etical B  
it is imp  
second L  
ter expla  
confess to  
*Optatus* c  
he had be  
ally cha  
What f  
who scrup  
any Person  
want a P  
misrepres  
What c  
non Sense  
for such p  
who to t  
Function,  
publick M  
schism.  
Thus we  
lying Fad  
itude in E  
ies are inc  
the Church  
uch Princ  
which put  
Lombard, I  
Collector  
middle-rat  
of one WH  
er to Rep  
ould by n  
one such ?  
Page 11.  
athers of  
was done t  
esides, Dr

etical Baptism be not explicitly mention'd, yet it is implied in the Term *EVEN*, (which the second Line in the Contents of his first Chapter explains) which any ordinary Scholar will confess to imply more than is express; and had *Optatus* confin'd himself only to Lay-Baptism, he had been guilty of as great a Solecism as they falsely charge him with.

What safety in dealing with such Tricksters? who scruple not to blacken the Reputation of any Person they engage with, and rather than want a Pretence, impose upon the World by misrepresenting the plain Meaning of an Author.

What can be a greater Affront to the Common Sense of Mankind? Can any have a Value for such pretenders to Learning and Theology, who to the discredit of their Education and Function, make no bones of lying in the most publick Manner, in defence of their ridiculous schism.

Thus we see what Advances some of the High-lying Faction have made towards a Popish Latitude in Religion, where the greatest Enormities are indulg'd, so they tend to the Benefit of the Church; and if these Gentlemen Act upon such Principles, I despair of their Conversion: which puts me in mind of a Story of *Peter Lombard*, Master of the Sentences, *Gratian* the Collector of the Decrees, and *Peter Comestor* a middle-rate Schoolman, that were the Bastards of one Whore; who when her Confessor called her to Repentance, briskly answered, That she could by no means Repent of that which had done such Service to the Holy Church.

Page 11. It's true *Optatus* did not quote the Fathers of the Three first Centuries, because it was done to every Body's Hands by Mr. *Bingham*. Besides, Dr. *Cave*, and others, have told us long ago,



ago, that there was no doubt to be made of the Practice and Approbation of Lay-Baptism in the first Centuries. *Prim. Christ. p. 200.*

Page 12. The Account of *Athanasius's* Indicrous Baptism, given us by *Sozomen*, is rejected by the Answerer as doubtful, who blames *Optatus* for repeating it without saying so.

*Optatus* knew it was doubted, and by whom; but thought it needless to acquaint a Library-Keeper with it. Whether the Story be true or false, it equally serves his turn, since (let it be tacked to *Sozomen* when it wou'd) it gives us a Taste of the Sentiments of those Times; and therefore the Passage is only related as it was found in the Historian: And *Dr. Cave* doth the same in his *Primitive Christianity*, without telling us it was spurious.

This Page also charges *Optatus* with a notorious Falshood, for calling Mr. L — t — y a Deacon, who it seems had commenc'd Priest some few Moons before the late Re-Baptization.

A possible Chance! If it was a Mistake, it was a venial one, and not capable of such monstrous Consequences as they forcibly and fallaciously draw from it; nevertheless, since his Priesthood did not destroy his Deaconship, it was not improper to stile him Deacon, because he was Baptized as a Deacon, and not strictly as a Priest: the distinguishing Characteristick of a Priest being Pastoral Care, and Administration of the Eucharist.

Thus I have amused my self in pursuit of my rambling *Amazon*, from whom I expected some formidable Resistance, but find by her new Way of fighting, that all her *Lashes* are very Soft; and I don't question, but, before I have done with her, she'll dwindle into pure Passive Obedience and Non-resistance, and leave the Argu-

ment

ent as much unanswered as when she found

So much for their Remarks upon *Optatus's* first Chapter, the Argumentative part of which, the Answerers have not thought fit to meddle with, (saving that of *Athanasius*, which I have sufficiently obviated) notwithstanding their promise to join Issue with him, p. 9.

## C H A P. II.

HAVING thus removed the Rubbish out of the way, I come to consider more particularly, what the doughty Answerers say to the Arguments drawn from the Sense of the Church; which after all their Efforts, still remain impregnable; notwithstanding *all the Assistance they have plentifully borrow'd from their flying Auxiliaries, Dr. Bret, and Lawrence,* will appear upon a Scrutiny.

### A R G U M E N T I.

*Augustin Optatus* affirm'd, That the Church of England owns the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, by ordering her Clergy to pray for her, *Can. 55.* ——— To this they only say, that they question whether our Church means the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and then ask whether there were no Episcopal Congregations then in North-Britain! and why mayn't we understand these only to be the Church of Scotland?

What egregious Trifling is this! when all the World knows that the Scots-Church was then entirely Presbyterian, and so understood by this Canon,

Canon; and if there were any separate Congregations, they were rather Popish than otherwise. What an intolerable Impeachment also is this of the Sincerity of our Church, in making her guilty of such a wretched Piece of mental Reservation, as to Order her Clergy to pray for a National Church, and then mean no more by it than a few Separatists? Besides, the Bishops that were made in *Scotland*, were only titular, Presbyterially Baptiz'd and Ordained, and were subject to the *Direction* and *Censure* of the *Presbytery*. As *Spotswood* Arch-bishop of *St. Andrews* informs us, *Hist.* p. 452, and 456.

The Answerers conclude this Head, by telling us, the Clergy don't subscribe any Canons, but the Three Articles of the XXXVIth Canon.

Fit Persons these, to account for the Practice of the Church of *England*, who can impose such a palpable Juggle upon the World. They would fain insinuate their Exemption from the Canons by informing us, they only subscribe those three Articles; whereas indeed there's not one Canon that concerns the Clergy, but what they are oblig'd to observe, and are punishable for their neglect of; therefore it is supposed they implicitly subscribe all the Canons that relate to them in these three Articles, which are a Summary of them, else they would not be punishable for their Breach of 'em; for where there is no Law, there is no Transgression.

If they did not Subscribe, they swore to 'em in the Canonical Oath, wherein they are oblig'd to Obedience according to the Canons, especially to this LVth. Canon, which directs 'em in what Manner to pray for the Government, and the Churches under it.

ARGU

The  
Unepisc  
Answer,  
only, is n  
tion is not  
number of  
Legality  
e. at th  
One pa  
ther Asp  
Foundati  
1. As  
vinces w  
in 1712,  
History P  
but know  
which co  
(Sodor) ha  
terbury, v  
the dispr  
Reason t  
more the  
Torkish:  
among 'e  
cation, t  
tion, yet  
2. To  
tho' the n  
the Lega  
Juncture,  
Church;  
the Word  
belled at  
Doctrine



## ARGUMENT II.

The Bishops in Convocation 1712. declared Unepiscopal Baptism valid.—— To this they Answer, *The majority of the Bishops of one Province only, is not the Opinion of the Church; That Rebellion is not the Doctrine of the Church, tho' the greater number of the Bishops allow'd of, and contended for the Legality of Resistance at that dangerous Juncture, i. e. at the Revolution.*

One part of this Answer is false, and the other Asperges that Revolution, which is the Foundation of our present happy Government.

1. As to the first, The Bishops of both Provinces were unanimous against Re-baptization in 1712, as Mr. *Bingham* shews in his *Scholastick History* Part II. which these Sparks could not but know. But suppose the Province of York, which consists only of four Bishops (*excludator Sodor*) had dissented from the Province of Canterbury, which consists of Twenty Two Bishops, the disproportion is so great, that I have more Reason to say the *Canterburian Resolution* was more the Judgment of the Church than the *Yorkish*: But after all, there were no Dissenters among 'em, and the Lower House of Convocation, tho' they did not subscribe that Declaration, yet did not think fit to censure it.

2. To illustrate this, the Answer tells us, tho' the majority of the Bishops contended for the Legality of Resistance at that dangerous Juncture, yet Rebellion is not the Doctrine of the Church; that is, without straining the Sense of the Words, *Tho' the major part of the Bishops rebelled at the Revolution, yet Rebellion is not the Doctrine of the Church.*

If this be not a Seditious Reflection I am mistaken, and nothing but the *Obscurity* and *Insignificance* of these Scribblers can protect 'em from the Resentment of the Law, for their factiously Suggesting the late *Glorious Revolution* to be *Rebellion*.

Under this Head, our Answerers make use of their *Amazon's Tongue*, to traduce her Uncle under the Scoffing Epithets of *Grave* and *Infallible Elder*, which is but too broad an Imputation of the Principles of her Seducers, viz. Contempt of the Fifth Commandment, and serious Religion, if not cloath'd with High Church Gay *Fercularities*; for tho' this Gentleman be a Person of known Integrity and Seriousness, far Superior to any of the Re-baptizing Sect his unhappy Niece is engaged with yet, it seems, his great Worth makes him more the object of their Envy and Hatred, than of that Esteem which is due to all good Men.

### ARGUMENT III.

*Optatus* affirm'd, That the Church of England owns the Presbyterian Baptism of the Foreign Reformed Churches.— The Answerer says, *deny not the thing*: Well then since we are agreed upon that Head, I'll dismiss it in Peace, tho' I can't well apprehend what he means, when he says of the Prayers of the Church, viz. *That we are at Liberty to take 'em in any Sense, which the Words themselves will fairly admit of*; for that Sense *Optatus* has already affix'd to 'em, they will fairly admit of; now if they admit of any other Meaning, they may admit of a great many more, which is making a meer Nose of Wax of 'em; and a throwing the Church Doors wider open than the Constitution will bear.

AR-

## ARGUMENT IV.

The greatest Divines of the Church have been against Re-baptization, as Archbishop *Whitgift*, *Bancroft*, *Bilson*, *Grindal*, *Jewel*, and the University of *Oxford* too, in a Letter to *Geneva*. The Answerer allows all this, but can't yield to the Judgment of particular Persons, adding, that he doth not know what the University meant by those Complemental Expressions, but the generality of her Members at present, deny the Validity of Presbyterian Baptism. p. 14, 15.

1. He allows these great Men of the Church to be against Re-baptization, and so grants what was designed in the Argument, viz. That proving the greatest Men in the Church were of that Opinion, was one good step towards the proving the Church it self was so. But more than this, even Bishop *Cousin*, *Thorndike*, the *Cassandrian*, and that great Oracle of the High-Church, Archbishop *Laud*, allow'd of Baptism even by Women in cases of Necessity; and the last of these tells us, it is not the Authority of Ministers that giveth Being or Force to the Sacrament.

2. He makes *Oxford* a very coarse Complement, in taxing that Learned Body with Insincerity and Fickleness. That University, in a Letter dated Feb. 5. 1706. did acknowledge the Presbyterian Church of *Geneva* to be a true Church; and this Acknowledgment the Answerer calls a Complemental Expression, and tells us, the generality of her Members now are of another Mind, as if they were as fickle in their Doctrines as in their Politicks, and the latter were the Rule of the former; but if it be so, we shall cease meddling any further with those who are



so much given to change; tho' before I dismiss this Head, I must tell him, that both *Oxford* and *Cambridge* did, in the Year 1603. declare under their own Hands for the Validity of Lay-Baptism, so that it's no new thing: Neither has the Church as such, Repealed it by any Convocational Act. *vid. Manch. Library for a Quære Entituled, An Answer ——— to the Petition of some Ministers of the Church of England, desiring Reformation of certain Ceremonies.*

#### ARGUMENT V.

The Church of *England* is so far from condemning Presbyterian Baptism, that she allow'd of Baptism by Midwives even since the Reformation.

To this the Answerer says, *The Rubrick now allows none but the Minister to Baptize, confirm'd by Act of Parliament, which is a more proper Rule for Clergymen to walk by, than the Judgment of particular Persons, either before or since the Reformation.*

1. As to the Validity of Baptism by Women, it was the received opinion of the Church, and not of particular Persons only, as the Answerer suggests; so the Bishop of *London* said, in the *Hampton Court Conference*, and added, *That Lay-Baptism was agreeable to the practice of the Ancient Church*, for which he quoted *Acts 2. v. 41.* the Answerer being gravel'd here, passes it by in profound Silence.

2. The Rubrick directs lawful Ministers to Baptize, but no where forbids or condemns the Baptisms of others who are out of her Communion; nay, considering all the Rubricks together, they rather make even for Lay-Baptism than against it. For they plainly tell us, that the Matter of Baptism, which is the *Water*, and the form, Sprinkling of it on a Person in the

the Name of the Sacred Trinity, are the *Essentials* of *Baptism*; neither doth it allow the repetition of such a Baptism, let the Administrator be who he will; evidently excluding the Person administering from being an Essential part of that Ordinance; therefore the last Rubrick about Infant Baptism, specifies only *one Case*, wherein that Sacrament is to be *renew'd*, and that is, when the Person suppos'd to be Baptized, was not Baptized with *Water in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; but no where Countenances a Re-iteration of Baptism, tho' administer'd by Lay-men, if done with Water, in the Name of the Father, Son and Spirit. And I think no Man can prove any Minister to be absolutely and always necessary to the being of a Sacrament.

3. I cannot but Smile to see these *Jure Divino* Theo — — logs, like so many *Proteus's*, turn, twist, and change themselves into different shapes according to the different Complexion of the times; t'other Day, they were Tooth and Nail for the Churches Independency on the State, and for shaking off the wholesome Yoke, the Glorious Reformation clapt upon them; but now Parliamentary Right takes place; they are fond, forsooth, of quoting an Act of Parliament, as a proper rule for the *Clergy to walk by*, i. e. if it be for the Advancement of their Interest, otherwise they value it no more than the Tale of a Tub.

Now, since an Act of Parliament is become as it were an Article of your Creed, I hope you'll entertain more favourable Thoughts of Presbyterian Baptism, since it is allow'd and confirm'd by several Acts of Parliament, and not contend with Lawful Authority by Scribbling against the Validity of its Acts and Determinations,

nations, a practice so contrary to your avowed Principle of unlimited Obedience.

Thus then, 1<sup>st</sup>, Presbyterian Baptism administered under the *Oliverian Usurpation* was confirm'd by King *Charles II.* as I am inform'd but don't positively assert, because I have not the Statute Book by me.

2. The *Scots Presbyterian Baptism* is recognized and confirm'd by the Act of Union with *Scotland*, which declares *their Religion to be the true Protestant Religion, and that the Presbyterian Government shall be the only Government of that Church.* vid. Union Act.

3. The Reform'd Baptism in *Germany*, perform'd by unprelatical Divines, is acknowledged in the Act of Settlement.

#### ARGUMENT VI.

The Validity of Presbyterian Baptism is recognized by the Church in giving them Christian Burial. To this he answers, *That in his weak Judgment, the Clergy seem restrained from doing it, and are in no danger for refusing.* This is another Falshood; for the Clergy are obliged to read the Form of Burial over any Corps that is brought to the Church or Church-yard, except Communicated Persons excepted, and are Punishable for Refusal or Neglect, with three Months Suspension, as the LXVIII. Canon expressly declares in these Words, *No Minister shall refuse or delay to Christen any Child, ——— or to Bury any Corpse that's brought to the Church or Church-yard (convenient warning being given) and if he shall refuse to Christen the one, or Bury the other (except as before) he shall be suspended by the space of three Months.* He is a desperate Man who dare venture upon the Mouth of a Cannon, that's loaded with the Anathema's of the Church.



## A R G U M E N T VII.

The Bishops confirm those who are Presbyterially Baptized, which supposes them to be Christians.

To which the Answerer says, *This only proves the irregularity of the Bishops practice, if they did it knowingly, it being a flat Contradiction to the publick form of Confirmation, and that the Fault lies most at the Door of the inferior Clergy, p. 16.*

It's certain the Bishops have done it knowingly, especially at the Restoration, nor do I find that any have scrupled it since; and I believe these young Dictators can, if they please, tell the World of a Bishop, who in their time confirm'd some Presbyterian Children, tho' advertis'd by an inferior Clergyman what they were.

Besides, tho' the Confirmation-Form mentions Godfathers, yet it was not intended to exclude Children who had Sponsors of another kind; this will appear, both from the end of Confirmation, which is the renewing their Baptismal Covenant, and the *Qualifications* required for it, that the Children can say the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and Ten Commandments. All this confirm'd by their Lordship's practice.

Now for these Underlings, who by their Canonical Oath, are attach'd to a due Obedience to the Bishops, to tax 'em not only with *Irregularity of Practice*, but with *acting in flat Contradiction to the Confirmation-Form*, is, (to borrow a little of their own darling Stile) such a degree of *Brazen Assurance and Impudence*, as would very ill become the most inveterate Sectarian in the Kingdom.

But they think to transfer the charge upon the *Inferior Clergy, as most Faulty*; a Sarcastic  
their

their *Fellow-Inferiors* will con 'em little Thank for.

### ARGUMENT VIII.

Presbyterians that turn to the Church, are own'd as Christians, and received into Communion, without any Objection made against their Baptism.

The Answerer grants the Argument, but questions, *Whether by the Rules of the Church it ought to be so*, and says, *some are against it*.

The general practice of the Church, is the best Comment upon its Rules, and to retort his own Argument upon him, *I cannot yield to the Judgment of particular Persons*, especially when the fewest and the meanest, to have any pretence to counterbypass the common Consent.

The judicious Clergy who admit Dissenters to Communion, act upon the true Principles of Christianity, and have no Reason to repeat their extensive Charity, that inseparable Characteristick of a real Christian; especially when they act in concurrence with the Church of Christ in all Ages, and only in opposition to a late upstart Faction, which owes its rise to a Popish Contrivance to disunite us, and the caprice of a few giddy Priests, who under pretext of the Church's safety (which was never in danger but from such as they) carry on Designs destructive of all free Societies, prostituting the Sacred Function, to be the Firebrands of the Party; which sort of Tools the Popish Conclave has found more subservient to their wicked Designs, than all their other Plots they ever form'd against us; witness the unhappy Civil War, and the late ferment of the Kingdom yet allay'd; both occasioned by the intemperance

Zeal and  
cal Too  
What  
his time  
of ours,  
Lampoc  
such on

— The  
The  
The  
Now  
For  
For  
But  
The  
Now  
(S  
Tho  
His  
Wel  
They

Excuse the  
little cha  
the Deu  
Schismat

Several  
the Chur  
Presbyter  
Church lo  
The An  
knows, bu  
allows Pres

Zeal and Fury of a few Insignificant Ecclesiastical Tools of a Party.

What *Dryden* said of such sort of Men in his time, may very well be apply'd to these of ours, with little variation, for I am far from Lampooning the Sacred Order, as he doth, but such only as are a Scandal to it.

— *The Factious Vermin that molest a State,  
The source of all Disorder and Debate,  
The bane of Princes, a tumultuous Crew,  
Not satisfied with what is Old or New.  
For James they underwent a wondrous Toyl,  
For him their Breasts with furious Zeal did boil:  
But when he to the Jesuits tack'd about,  
They, as the Devil, with Prayer cast him out;  
Nor are they with their new made Monarch glad,  
(Such Priests have still a Privilege to be Mad.)  
Tho' easy, gentle, and averse to Blood,  
His only Crime, he's to his Foes too good:  
Well may he have such Priests to be his Foes,  
They even ————— wou'd depose.  
Tribe of Levi, p. ult.*

Excuse this Digression, for I could not but be a little chagrin, to see what mean shifts these little Deuterobaptists make to support their Schismatical and Unchristian Cause.

#### ARGUMENT, IX.

Several have, and now actually do officiate in the Church, who were Baptized only by a Presbyterian Minister, which supposes the Church looks upon their Baptism as sufficient.

The Answerer allows this to be true for ought he knows, but it's no Demonstration that the Church allows Presbyterian Baptism. Whether he knows

D

it



it or no, is not Material; the thing proves itself; did you never hear of *Grace, Hurt, Garton, Griffiths, Palmer, Richardson*, and many others who lately Conform'd and Preach'd in the Church by virtue of their Presbyterian Baptism? And can we suppose these new Converts were made *Fathers* of the Church before they were *Sons*? Yet the Answerer says, *This is no Demonstration that the Church owns Presbyterian Baptism*: With Submission I think it is, for either the Church allows 'em to be Christians or not; if she doth, she owns their Baptism; if not, she admits of Persons to be Ministers, which are not not nominal Christians; an Assertion you dare not defend. Take which part of the Dilemma you please.

This is the first time I ever heard *Fact* deny'd to be *Demonstration*, and such a Blunder coming from *Man* — — — *ter Library* and its Neighbourhood, is more unpardonable than the *Sacheverellian* Axiom of Parallel Lines, meeting in the same Centre.

I find Universities can't always make Scholars, tho' they can make Graduates; Money often procures a Degree, when poor Merit goes without it.

As to the Dissenting Teacher's forging a Certificate, the discovery is perfectly new to me; if there be any such (which I have no reason to believe upon their Word) I remit him to the whosesome Severities of the High-church.

#### A R G U M E N T X.

The Deacons in the Church being no Priests, are but half Ministers, and yet the Baptism is valid.

To this they Answer, *That they are complete Ministers of Baptism, and it would have been*  
more

more for Optatus his Credit to have disproved, than to have Burlesqu'd this Order of Apostlick Institution; his doing the latter, is a shrewd Suspicion of his Inability to do the former. More Incongruities, as will appear by the two following Heads.

1. For a Man to be a compleat Minister of Baptism, and not be a compleat Minister of the Gospel, is to me unintelligible. Is the Sacred Function divided? Shew me where-ever any Person in the Gospel was ordained to one part of the Ministry, and not the whole; Produce if you can any Commission given to a Preaching Deacon, as an Officer distinct from a Presbyter in the *New Testament*; How comes the Ordination of Deacons to serve Tables, to make them also Preachers? If the Ordination of a Deacon makes him a Minister of the Word, how comes the Church to ordain him again?

2. Now that this Preaching, Baptizing Deacon, as it's an Order distinct from Presbyters, is not of Apostolical Institution, I thus prove. The seven Deacons mentioned in the *New Testament*, upon whom you found your Order, were Overseers of the Poor, and not Gospel Ministers. So the Text proves against all the World; Acts VI. 2, 3, 4. 'Tis not reason (says the Apostle) we should leave the Word of God and serve Tables, (i. e. the Poor) Wherefore look out among you Seven Men whom we may appoint over this Business, (i. e. Overseeing the Poor) But we'll give ourselves to the Ministry of the Word: So that from hence 'tis evident the Ministry of the Word, and serving Tables which was the Deacons Work, are two distinct Offices.

These Deacons, you see, were chosen by the people, not to Baptize and Preach, but to serve Tables; there's not one Word of their Ordination to the Gospel Ministry there.

This also is the Sense of Antiquity about Deacons. The Sixth general Council of Constantinople, held A. D. 692, in which were 168 Bishops, acknowledges the *Scripture Deacons* to be no more than Overseers of the Poor, and this was the Sense of the Fathers of former Ages. *Caran. Can. 16.*

Origen tells us, they were to dispense the Churches Money among the Poor; *Διδκονοι δὲ οὐκ ἐν τῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας χρημάτων*, in *Mat. Tom. 16.*

Dr. Cave gives us this Account of Deacons. viz. " That the Duty of their Place was, to  
 " take charge of those daily Provisions that  
 " were made for poor indigent Christians, and  
 " to distribute the Monies given for their Relief  
 " and deliver the Sacramental Elements to the  
 " People; and when some of these Deacons be-  
 " gan to take too much upon 'em, to distribute  
 " the Sacrament before the Bishop or Presbyter,  
 " and to take place among the Presbyters, the  
 " Council of Nice took notice of it, as a piece  
 " of bold and sawcy Usurpation, and severely  
 " commanded 'em to keep their place, and  
 " not sit down before the Presbyters, un-  
 " less it be by their leave and command, as it  
 " is expressed by the *Laodicean Synod.* *Prim. Christ. in Verb.*

According to the first Council of Arles, the Deacons are to do nothing of themselves, but to reserve the Honour to the Presbyters. *Ibid. Page 155, 156. Edit. V.*

The Question is not, Whether any of these Deacons Preach'd or Baptized afterwards; but whether they did so by Virtue of this Ordination to Oversee the Poor? which we deny, and defy all *M——ter* Library to prove.

Thus you see, the Reason why the Author of *Donatus* did not disprove Deacons as Preachers

and Bap-  
 yters,  
 common  
 to do it  
 such a M  
 no need  
 scripture

The C  
 Baptism.  
 administ  
 for that  
 permit h  
 Argumen  
 Now f  
 Heretica  
 rous, Q  
 on to qu  
 the Ordin  
 rely and  
 Pale of  
 it should  
 church ca  
 not so acc  
 The Re  
 rough, sp  
 Question,  
 " Doctrin  
 " The Co  
 " ed to  
 " to know  
 " and tha  
 " are no  
 " pifts is  
 " formed  
 " France :



and Baptizers distinct from Evangelists, Preachers, or gifted Lay-Preachers, (who were common in those Times) was not his inability to do it, but because he thought they who had such a Magazine of Learning near 'em, stood in no need of the Proof of a Thing so obvious in Scripture and Antiquity.

## ARGUMENT XI.

The Church of *England* admits of the Romish Baptism. He owns the Truth of this, *because administered by Bishops*; but his profound Respect for that Antichristian Hierarchy, wou'd not permit him to consider the Improvement of that Argument in *Donatus*.

Now since the Church of *Rome* is confessedly Heretical, and her Bishops and Priests Idolatrous, *Quære*, whether there be not some Reason to question the validity of her Baptism, and the Ordinations received from her? Because Heresy and Idolatry seem to put Persons out of the Pale of the Church, and there is more Reason it should be so, than that which the High-church calls Schism. I mean, whether this be not so according to this Novel Hypothesis?

The Reverend Dr. Kennet, Dean of *Peterborough*, speaking upon this Subject, puts the Question, "What is the Consequence of *this Doctrine* so industriously spread at *this Time*?"

"The Consequence is, and I doubt, was intended to be, that in our Communion it's hard to know who was rightly made a Christian; and that out of our Communion Protestants are no Christians. That the Baptism of Papists is good and valid; but that of the Reformed and of the Evangelical, (suppose in *France* and *Germany*) is Void and of no Effect:

"That

“ That we are nearer to Popery than we are  
 “ to the rest of the Reformation: — It  
 “ seems at this juncture to be calculated for the  
 “ Services of Popery, and for lessening the Pro-  
 “ testant Interest in *Europe*: — It favours  
 “ of the most Biggotted Papists, who would  
 “ confine Salvation to their own Party. — And  
 “ in this particular Case of Baptism, tho’ they  
 “ can allow their Midwives to perform it, yet  
 “ they have sometimes contended to admit none  
 “ of us Hereticks without the Re-baptizing  
 “ of us. — The Papists in their bitter Zeal  
 “ condemned our Baptism as invalid. *Spiritual*  
 “ *Sermon* 1714, p. 26, 27. See also the Margi-  
 “ nal Note. Add to this what is said in the *Politi-  
 cal State* for the Month of *May*, 1712. That  
 “ this Doctrine must at this Time apparently tend to  
 “ make some of the Protestant Line in Succession to be  
 “ meer Heathens, and the Popish Pretender to be a  
 “ better Christian; For no less is the Consequence,  
 “ whatever the Intention of such Doctrine may  
 “ appear to be.

## ARGUMENT XII.

The Church of *England* doth not Re-baptize those that were Baptized by Conforming Laymen.

The Answerer knows this to be true, and therefore very prudently passes it by; only Cavils a little with the Instance of Mr. D — le, who officiated as a Sham-Priest in the Church for Ten Years; but, as he says, sprinkled only Two or Three in that Time, which were afterwards Baptized by his Brother, p. 19.

This is absolutely False; for he Baptized many more, some of which have not been Baptized again, as I am assured since by their Pa-  
 rents

nts; and for your further Information, I refer you to the good Parish of *Ratcliff*, and particularly to Mr. *John Manchester* there, whose daughter is one of them.

In short, I am furnisht with several Instances of Lay-men, who by forged Orders officiated in the Church; and when detected, the Bishops did not think fit to Baptize them who were christen'd by 'em. Such Instances are notorious to the last Degree; whoever desires more particular Satisfaction, may apply themselves to the Bishops, especially to those of *Worcester*, *Oxford*, *Litchfield* and *Coventry*.

### CHAP. III.

Under this third distinction of his Book, *Optatus* represented the pernicious Consequences of Re-baptization in six Things, which the Answerer takes little Notice of, save the following Heads, and how little they are to the Purpose we shall soon see.

I. When he finds the Reformed Churches abroad have no Episcopal Baptism, and consequently by his Doctrine, are in a damnable Condition; to soften the Matter, he tells us, *They partake of the Privileges of the new Covenant, the uncovenanted Goodness of God; and that because their Ignorance is involuntary, and their Circumstances unavoidable.* p. 20.

But what a heap of nonsensical Jargon is here! for, 1. That *Covenant-Mercies* shou'd flow from *uncovenanted-Goodness*, is to me an intelligible



ligible Piece of Divinity, since the uncovenanted Goodness of God, can be no more than *absolute Mercy*, by which no Man was ever saved. It's true, this is the *Shibboleth* of the Party, which these young Divines have stumbled upon, without knowing the meaning of it; thus you see the boasted Charity of Modern High-Church dwindl'd to this, That none but themselves have a Covenant-Right to Salvation; and if any of the other Protestants be saved, it is by some uncovenanted Act of God, *i. e.* not by Jesus Christ, since all the Blessings of Redemption come to us by him in a Covenant way.

The Badge of the *English Church*, is *Charity*; but these her pretended Sons, have not only quitted that Christian Character, but espoused Notions destructive to her very Being, and use to the utmost their little sordid Efforts in defence of 'em.

2. He attributes the want of Episcopal Bap-  
tism among the reformed Abroad, to *involuntary Ignorance*.

As to that term of Art, I confess it is somewhat Mysterious, not knowing how Ignorance can be properly denominated from the Will; but let that be as it will, I am sure the Proposition is false; for the foreign Reformed Churches both know there is such a Thing as Episcopacy, and how necessary some Folks make it to the Essence of a Church; yet they still voluntarily reject it, and that for the same Reason as they did at the Reformation; for, it's plain, they reckon Episcopacy among the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, and therefore gave it no Place in the Reformation; and ever since vindicated themselves against all *Jure Divino* Episcopalian whatever. With what Face then can the pretenders to Learning put such a Sham upon the

World

World  
Protest  
cessity  
There  
avoidab  
stances  
Govern

II. H  
ther Ef  
to char  
dence, f  
prevails  
it canno  
Constitut  
thus muc  
they have  
Luthera  
of Episco  
I'll no  
plement,  
ly Ignor  
for after  
but had  
ken Not  
Head, w  
broad ha  
English Sp  
that, he  
of Bisho  
as Optat  
to call th  
Reforme  
true one,  
trary. H  
attempti  
with a b  
don's Ge

World, as to perswade 'em that the foreign Protestants are *involuntarily Ignorant* of the Necessity of Episcopacy.

Therefore, they are so far from being *under unavoidable Circumstances*, that whatever Circumstances they are under with Respect to Church-Government, 'tis the Effect of their own Choice.

II. Having complemented *Optatus* with another Essay of his good Breeding, he proceeds to charge him with *brazen Assurance and Impudence*, for asserting that *Presbyterian Government prevails among the Protestants Abroad*; and tells us, it cannot be supposed he can be acquainted with the *Constitutions of the foreign Churches Abroad*; but thus much he learns from *Gordon's Geography*, that they have *Arch-bishops and Bishops*, p. 20. tho' the Lutherans don't acknowledge the *Divine Institution of Episcopacy*, p. 21.

I'll not return the Gentleman's *brazen Complement*, but must tell him, either he is wretchedly Ignorant, or basely imposes upon his Reader, for after all, their *Government is Presbyterian*; but had he dealt fairly with *Optatus*, he had taken Notice of the next Paragraph under this Head, where he asserts, *That the Reform'd Abroad had no Diocesan Bishops of the Italian or English Species*. But instead of taking Notice of that, he very disingenuously runs upon the Cry of Bishops in general, without limiting them as *Optatus* did; and it's equally unjust in him to call that a *Pretended List* of the transmarine Reformed Churches, which I do affirm to be a true one, and defy any Person to prove the contrary. He was so sensible of this, that instead of attempting to overthrow it, he only confronts it with a bare List of Nominal Bishops out of *Gordon's Geography*. *Gordon* indeed tells us of

E

Arch-

Arch-bishops and Bishops there, but not a Word of their being Diocesans, or any way divinely Superior to Presbyters, which is the Question in Debate; this shews how weak an Argument can influence a prejudiced Inclination.

That the Reformed Churches abroad have no Diocesan Bishops, or any Order of Ministers which they allow to be *Jure Divino*, Superior to Presbyters, will appear from the following Considerations.

1. *From the Answerer's own Confession*, who says, *The Lutherans don't acknowledge the Divine Institution of Episcopacy*, p. 21. As to the Calvinists, no Body ever pretended to find the Thing or Name Bishop among them; which I insert by the Way, to inform my Adversary of the Constitutions of Foreign Churches, which he acknowledges he is not much acquainted with.

2. *We may judge of the foreign Reformed Churches by their Writers, their Articles and Confessions.*

*Le Blanc*, speaking of this Subject, says, " 'Tis the more general Opinion of the English, that Episcopacy and Presbytery are distinct Offices; but the rest of the Reform'd, as also they of the *Augustan Confession*, do unanimously believe that there is no such distinction by divine Right, *Theses Sedan*. — There are others that treat Occasionally of the Nature of the foreign Ecclesiastical Government, and they all assert, 'tis lodg'd and exercis'd in and by Ministers acting in Parity, " and " not by Diocesan Bishops; as *Musculus*, *Zanchy*, " *Ravanel*, *Jurieu* —

Add to this what the present State of *Denmark* says, viz. " That there be there Six Superintendants, who take it very kindly to be " called Bishops; these have no Temporalities, " no

" no E  
" with  
" but a  
" Equi

Abbo  
den, tel

" the E

" cal J

" are c

" der t

" dants

" Nam

3. T

about t

dent fr

tell us t

This

Donatus

hope w

Oppone

III. I

ment de

which is

St. Paul

is not B.

make a

Oh r

was Ba

stian?

this Hy

we Def

From

stian M

Baptism

sufficient

the Bil



“ no Ecclesiastical Courts, have no Cathedrals  
 “ with Prebends, Canons, Deans, Sub-deans,  
 “ but are only *primi inter Pares*, the First among  
 “ Equals, Chap. 16. p. 231.

Abbot Vertot likewise, in his account of Swe-  
 den, tells us, “ That the Reformation deprived  
 “ the Bishops there of their former Ecclesiasti-  
 “ cal Jurisdiction; there are Ten Bishops who  
 “ are confined to their own Employment; un-  
 “ der them there be Seven or Eight *Superinten-*  
 “ *dants*, who differ only from the *Bishops* in  
 “ Name.

3. The Opinion of the Reformed Abroad,  
 about the equality of Ministers, is further evi-  
 dent from their Confessions, which at first sight  
 tell us their Government is *Presbyterial*.

This is sufficient to acquit the Author of  
*Donatus* from the Charge of *Impudence*, and I  
 hope will be of some Use to inform my Ignorant  
 Opponent.

III. He says, “ That the Efficacy of a Sacra-  
 ment depends not upon a Minister's own Baptism,  
 which is a personal Qualification relating to himself.  
 St. Paul was a Bishop before he was baptized, and it  
 is not Baptism, but a sufficient Call that serves to  
 make a Bishop or Priest in a Christian Church, p. 22.

Oh rare Parson! Was Paul a Bishop before he  
 was Baptiz'd? a Minister before he was a Chri-  
 stian? What need of further Dispute, since by  
 this Hypothesis more is unwarily granted than  
 we Desire?

From hence he infers, a Man may be a Chri-  
 stian Minister without the Personal qualification of  
 Baptism; for it is not Baptism, adds he, but a  
 sufficient Call that makes a Bishop or Priest; that is,  
 the Bishop may Ordain a Person to make others

Christians, who is no Christian himself, according to the Rules of the Church, which makes Baptism a previous Qualification to the Ministry ; Baptism is therefore call'd Christening, because thereby the Child is made a Christian.

If Men may be Ministers, and validly administer all Ordinances without Baptism, what Necessity is there of Baptism ? and why such strange Clamours against Dissenters for want of it ?

So that this Notion (which he borrows from the Author of Lay-baptism) is so far from being sufficient to vanquish any Scruples about the validity of Baptism, that it rather increases them ; or at least has something in it, that may tempt Men to slight the Ordinance of Baptism ; since according to these Gentlemens Logick, a Man may be a good Minister without it.

This Undervaluing and Contempt of Baptism is a Branch of the *Manichean* and *Messalian* Heresy, *Aug. de Hæresibus*, 46, 59, and very well deserves the Notice of a Convocation.

But see how the Sons of Uniformity differ among themselves ; Mr. *Dodwell* tells the World, there's no *Immortality* or *Salvation* without *Episcopal-baptism* ; but here be Sticklers for the Church, that make no more of Baptism than an insignificant Ceremony, by telling us a Man may be a *Christian Minister*, nay, an *Apostle*, without Christian *Baptism*.

Rare Champions for Episcopacy ! which can't but flourish when supported by such Advocates on *Both Sides* ; but it's well known the thinking Part of the Church soon disown'd Mr. *Dodwell's* Principle, attributing it to a Delirious frenzy (they say) he contracted in his latter Years : This new Fan y favours as much  
of

the Mad-man, and betrays a *greater defect* Judgment and Learning than the former, in much as it more immediately overthrows the very Hypothesis they pretend to maintain it; for if *Baptism* be such an indifferent thing, that a Man may be a *Minister* without it's equally indifferent by whom it is Admitted. Thus a bad Cause unavoidably leads its defenders to manifest Absurdities.

IV. The Author of *Donatus* is said to make King G. a coarse Complement upon his Accession to the Throne, in calling him P — n, which if it should gain Credit, wou'd give the far greatest part of his Subjects an Aversion to his Majesty, and render his Government uneasy and unsafe, p. 23.

This Paragraph carries with it such a scurvy and seditious Insinuation, as if the Answerer design'd, by copying after Dr. Sacheverel, to make himself notorious; tho' I wou'd advise him to continue in his Obscurity, and avoid all learned Contentions, any of which are too hard for such soft Tools as he and his Accomlices, to make any thing of, if they haggle at no better than they have done at this.

But above all things, I wou'd have him avoid Politicks, which High-flying Ecclesiasticks seldom can meddle with, without incurring the penalty of the Law; which if Executed, might endanger the Abridgment of their Ears.

The Consequences he draws from the Supposition of his Majesty's being a P — n, prove what I say; for if there be any meaning in 'em, they are a kind of Threatning of the Government, from a Party whose Nature is too often known rebel against Principle: But be that as it will, we have a King on the Throne, (whom God will preserve) who'll do Justice to all, and Fear none;



none ; a King, who will not only preserve the Church inviolably, but will contribute to her Glory and Beauty more than any have done before him. A King, under whose Wife Government, Religion, Learning, and Commerce will flourish to that degree, as to make *Great-Britain* the Admiration and Praise of the whole Earth.

V. As to the Fathers, he charges *A. Optatus* with his Ignorance of them ; because he calls Dionysius Alexandrinus, D. Alexander ; that they were too sharp Tools for Dissenters to meddle with, and that they were all for Episcopal Government, p. 23.

It's a pretty way of proving a Man's Ignorance of Books by the *Errata's* of the Press, or the mistake of the Amanuensis. I can assure the Reader, that in *Optatus's* Original Manuscript was writ thus, *Dionys. Alexandr.* which is a common way of Abbreviation ; but had it been so, as long as the Author quoted *Nicephorus* whence he transcrib'd the Instance, no Person can Judge it to be any more than a meer accidental Oversight. But a sinking Cause catches at any thing, be it never so small and trivial.

As for the Fathers, being too sharp Tools for a Dissenter to meddle with without cutting his Fingers, it's only an Excursion of the Answerer's Ricketty Wit ; but I must tell him, the Presbyterians are as intimate with the Fathers, as the Episcopalians, and have proved as much, if not more than they have from 'em. However, the Jest, if it be one, returns upon himself, for he tacitly confesses the care he took of his own Fingers, by his not making any use of the Ancient Writers in defence of his Cause which he subtilly neglected, by personating

Voman ;  
ept up to  
voided t  
discover  
As to t  
or Episc  
alse Infin  
ino Super  
Next to  
liged to  
stert the  
ers of  
Deacon,  
yter ; an  
inct from  
inction i  
adversari  
Neither  
fathers,  
pecificall  
Besides  
erning th  
Church a  
with wha  
ble Repu  
subject.

Baptism  
we ma  
which  
dained  
mon in  
vided t  
selves)  
of nee  
Tertulli  
can dou

Woman; but had he been Solicitous to have kept up to the Female Character, he had equally avoided those little Criticisms upon 'em, which discover his Artifice.

As to the whole current of Antiquity's being for Episcopal Government, it's altogether a false Insinuation, if he means by it a *Jure Divino* Superiority of Ministers.

Next to the Bible, the Dissenters are most obliged to the Primo-primitive Fathers, who assert the Divine Right but of two distinct Orders of Church-Officers, viz, *Presbyter* and *Deacon*, often Identifying Bishop and *Presbyter*; and where they mention Bishops as distinct from, or superior to Presbyters, the distinction is Gradual, and not Ordinal; let our Adversaries prove the contrary if they can. Neither the *New Testament*, nor the Ancient Fathers, do any where affirm Bishops to be a specifically distinct Order from Presbyters.

Besides what Mr. *Bingham* has proved, concerning the Opinion of the first Fathers of the Church about Lay-Baptism; I shall conclude with what two Modern Divines of unquestionable Repute in the *English Church* say on that subject.

—— “ *Cyprian* being — severe against Baptism administered by Heretical Ministers, we may wonder what he thought of that which was administered by meer Lay, Unordained Persons, which yet was not uncommon in those Times; for that Lay-men (provided they were Christians and Baptized themselves) might and did Baptize others in cases of necessity, is so positively asserted by *Tertullian*, *Hierom*, and others, that no Man can doubt of it; a Custom ratified by the Fa-

“ there

“ thers of the *Illiberine Council*, *Cave's Primitive Christianity*, Edit. V. p. 199, 200.

This Quotation sufficiently shews the Sense of Antiquity, as the next does that of the Church of England concerning Lay-Baptism.

“ The new Doctrine (says the excellent Dean of *Peterborough*) that Persons Baptized by any Minister not Episcopally Ordained (whether at Home or in Foreign Protestant Churches) must Renounce their Baptism as invalid, and ought to be Re-baptized; Doctrine expressly contrary to the Judgment and Practice of our own Church, and sufficiently confuted by the best of our Divines of the past and present Age. *Spittal Sermon* March 30. 1714.

Thus, Gentlemen Answerers (however dignify'd or distinguish'd) I have traced you thro' the Labyrinth of your taudry Performance, and instead of finding Solid Argument and Academical Breeding, have been in pursuit of *Will o' the Wisp's* and *Jack a Lanthorns*, or some such Erratick Lights of the Party, that upon Examination, have proved to be nothing else but gross Vapours, exhal'd from a Bog of Assurance and Ignorance, by the heat of blind Zeal, which upon the approach of that bright Sun, Truth, disappeared. If ever you intend to make a second Apparition, pray let it be in your own Form, and talk in a Dialect you wou'd like to be answer'd in; but if, as you have done, you Answer Argument with Banter, and Banter with Argument, depend upon it, I'll have you posted for *Insufficients*, and consign'd over to the *Infirmary*.

And so Gentlemen, Farewell



T O

*Mrs. Jane Chorlton.*

M A D A M,

**T**HE Honour I retain for your Worthy and Learned Father's Memory, and the Respect I have for several of your nearest Relations, engages me to be much concern'd for the unhappy Circumstances you have brought your self into ; I mean, not your being a Church-woman, but the ill Consequences of the Way you took to be so.

' Had you continued firm in those Principles that Great Divine and Christian, Mr. *Chorlton* instructed you in, you had maintain'd an unblemish'd Character, among all the sober and intelligent Persons of your Acquaintance in both Parties ; But now you have expos'd your Reputation to the last Degree, in suffering your self to be carry'd away to the Belief of unchristian Opinions, and then in defending (if the Title Page of a late Pamphlet publish'd in your Name, speak Truth)

F

' your

‘ your Misfortune after such a Manner, and  
 ‘ with such a Spirit as seems to contradict  
 ‘ real Conversion.

‘ *Your* extream Zeal, while you were among  
 ‘ the Dissenters, was observ’d by some, who  
 ‘ prognosticated a Change from it ; for as it  
 ‘ was somewhat too remote from Charity, so  
 ‘ it gave reasonable grounds of suspecting you  
 ‘ understood not the Principles you adhered to  
 ‘ and the Effect has made good the Suspicion  
 ‘ and where your present more exorbitant Vio-  
 ‘ lences may End, God only knows.

‘ I appeal to your self, whether or no you  
 ‘ did not some Years ago think, you had a  
 ‘ good Reason for what you believed at that  
 ‘ Time, as you now think you have for what  
 ‘ you believe at this ? It may be you’ll say  
 ‘ you find you were mistaken, and are resolved  
 ‘ to stick where you are : But whether this Re-  
 ‘ solution don’t proceed from the Neglect of  
 ‘ a due Comparison of the Sentiments you  
 ‘ have quitted, with those you have embrac-  
 ‘ ed, or a worse Cause, may be a proper Que-  
 ‘ stion.

‘ Your Case seems to be somewhat Parallel  
 ‘ to that of a *King of France*, who when he  
 ‘ had heard the Protestants and Papists argu-  
 ‘ gue the distinguishing Points of their Belief  
 ‘ wou’d not determine which Side he was  
 ‘ for, by what he had heard in the Dis-  
 ‘ pute ; but propos’d a Question to this Pur-  
 ‘ pose, Whether Salvation might be had in  
 ‘ both Communions ? The *Papists*, out of  
 ‘ their *High Zeal*, denied all Salvation to be  
 ‘ attainable out of their Church ; the *Prote-*  
 ‘ *stants*, on the other Hand, out of their  
 ‘ *Condescending Charity*, said they wou’d not

‘ deny

deny  
 Popish  
 min’d  
 would  
 Papists  
 and t  
 obtain  
 ‘ That  
 ( I wo  
 engage  
 Tempe  
 limitin  
 Now y  
 have t  
 have r  
 The fir  
 so cal  
 which  
 vation  
 one or  
 Applic  
 ‘ It’s  
 rive at  
 to Un  
 zed, a  
 their  
 wanted  
 Damnin  
 ‘ Episc  
 of Con  
 continu  
 a-Days  
 History  
 been f  
 no Mar  
 Diocesa  
 there ;

deny the possibility of Salvation in the Popish Way. Whereupon the King determin'd for the Popish Religion, saying, He would be on the safest Side; since the Papists confin'd Salvation to their Church, and the Protestants allow'd it might be obtain'd in that Community.

'That Party in the Church of *England* (I won't say of it) with whom you are engaged, seem to be much of the Popish Temper I just now mention'd, and are for limiting all Christianity to themselves. Now your own Reason will tell you they have the best Title to Christianity, who have most of the Characteristicks of it: The first Practical Characteristick (if I may so call it) of Christianity, is Charity, which is certainly more necessary to Salvation than Baptism, as administred from one or another sort of Men. I leave the Application of it to your self.

'It's strange you should on a sudden arrive at that degree of Uncharitableness, as to Unchristianize all Unepiscopally Baptized, and afford 'em no other Basis for their Hope of Salvation, but the *Uncovenanted Mercies* of God; which is in Effect, Damning them.

'*Episcopacy* and *Presbytery* have been a Bone of Contention for some Ages, and still continue to be so; but the dispute now-a-Days is chiefly maintain'd from Church-History, the Matter of *Presbytery* having been so far evinced from Scripture, that no Man of Sense will pretend to find any Diocesan Bishop, especially such as ours are, there; so that the Divine Right of *Episcopacy*



' pacy falls to the Ground, and is already quitted by the best Sticklers for it.

' *But* if this Matter were still dubious from Scripture, the uncharitableness of your proceeding could not be justified; for a Practice like yours, demands a Truth capable of the fullest Demonstration for its Foundation.

' *Your* Re-baptization by an Episcopal Hand was not defensible, unless you thought it necessary to Salvation: You could not think it necessary to Salvation, without thinking all that are not Episcopally Baptized out of the Way to Salvation. These cannot be rightly believed by any Person, till he is demonstratively perswaded of the Divine Right of Episcopacy, exclusive and prohibitive of all other Forms of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

' Pray, *Madam*, has the Divine Right of Episcopal Church Government Exclusive and Prohibitive of all others, been demonstrated to you, or did you take it upon trust? if the former, it's your Duty to oblige the World with such a Proof, as it never yet had: if the latter, you were much to blame in assenting to such bold Opinion Hand over Head; which, if you have no other Reason for them but implicit Faith, are ridiculous and nonsensical, and not only so but wicked unchristian Errors too.

' I beg of you therefore, that you'll so far consult your own ease and quiet, as impartially to Review what you have done, and fairly once more to consider what both Sides have to offer for themselves. Be not so much Bigotted, as to think those weak

' Me

Men (you have fancied) capable of being compared with (much less of outbalancing) those many Pious and Great Men in the *English Church* as well as elsewhere, who differ from 'em in their Judgment and Practice.

'We read of but one Baptism in Scripture, the Unity of which the Antient Christians were so solicitous to maintain, that they look upon the re-iteration of Baptism, tho' administred by a known Lay-Hand, to be no less than a Rent in the Body of Christ. If you shou'd, by the close Exercise of your Reason, come to a due Knowledge of the Merits of the Cause, I hope you'll acquit your self so like a Christian, as to think it more honourable to quit an Error, than stubbornly persist there in.

'To be free with you, Did you not for some Years together Recognize your first Baptism, and the Obligations of it? Don't your Conscience tell you that you consented to all that Duty you owe to God, not only as a Creature, but as a Christian? Did not you frequently take the God of your Fathers for your God, and please your self with the claim you could make to his Favour from your first solemn Dedication to him? Sure you did. How could you then by your late Re-baptization give the lie to all this? How could you without Horror renounce a solemn Baptism, which God and good Men have always own'd? Can you think on this profane Renunciation with Complacency? I am sure you cannot, but rather with Fear  
'and

' and Trembling, that you have thus jested  
 ' with Holy Things; and unless your Con-  
 ' science be cauterized, it will bleed a-fresh  
 ' at every serious Review of what you have  
 ' done.

' Besides, were the Obligations you laid  
 ' your self under before your second Bap-  
 ' tism, valid or no? If they were, and you  
 ' resolv'd to the utmost of your Power to  
 ' fulfill 'em, What better Title did you need  
 ' to your Christianity? If no Obligations  
 ' were valid before your Re-baptism; what  
 ' a Gap is laid open to profaneness? How  
 ' may Persons play at fast and loose with  
 ' the most Sacred Things, upon pretence of  
 ' scrupling their Baptism?

' But after all, *Madam*, I am willing to  
 ' excuse it for you as far as its possible, and  
 ' wou'd think that you have been imposed  
 ' upon in this Affair, by the Officioufness  
 ' of some Persons who had opportunity by  
 ' your incapacity of Judging in this Matter,  
 ' to Work upon you; for I am satisfied the  
 ' first Occasion of your Scruple was not pure-  
 ' ly and primarily from your self; but what  
 ' might be the immediate Cause of your  
 ' pretended Conversion, I shall not enquire  
 ' into, since you have intimated the utmost  
 ' Aversion to its being divulged; however, I  
 ' hope, when the heat of this Business is  
 ' over, and you can make a cool Examina-  
 ' tion of it, you'll be sensible how sadly  
 ' you have been imposed on.

' If you experience within your self upon  
 ' this Change, better and more Christian  
 ' Dispositions than you had before (tho' it  
 ' will fall short of a Proof to others) yet  
 ' it

it may  
 but if  
 charital  
 Behavior  
 private  
 have t  
 conclud  
 thing e  
 and ref  
 or othe  
 may, i



it may be some Perswasion to your self :  
 but if on the contrary you are more Un-  
 charitable, less careful of your Time and  
 Behaviour, less frequent and fervent in your  
 private as well as publick Devotion, you  
 have the best Reason in the World to  
 conclude, that your new Opinion is no-  
 thing else but the Product of an unstable  
 and restless Mind, and I believe one Day  
 or other you'll find it so ; which that you  
 may, is the earnest Wish of

*Your Humble Servant,*

N. N.

---

**FINIS.**

may be some persons to your life:  
the contrary you are more con-  
siderable, less careful of your Time and  
business, less frequent and fervent in your  
prayer as well as publick Devotion, you  
have the best Reason in the World to  
conclude, that your new Opinion is no-  
thing else but the Product of an unsteady  
and restless Mind, and I believe one Day  
you will find it so; which that you  
may, is the earnest Wish of

Sam. Clarke 27<sup>th</sup>

N. W.

FINIS